Residue Coulomb interaction among isobars and its influence in symmetry energy of neutron-rich fragment

C. W. MA[1],* S. S. WANG[1,2], Y. L. ZHANG[1], and H. L. WEI[1]
Institute of Particle and Nuclear Physics, Henan Normal University, Xinxiang 453007, China
[2] *Shanghai Institute of Applied Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai 201800, China*
(Dated: February 25, 2014)

The residue Coulomb interaction (RCI), which affects the results of symmetry energy of neutron-rich nucleus in isobaric yield ratio (IYR) methods, is difficult to be determined. Four RCI approximations are investigated: (1) the M1–RCI adopting the a_c/T (the ratio of Coulomb energy coefficient to temperature) determined from the IYR of mirror-nuclei fragment; (2) the M2–RCI by fitting the difference between IYRs; (3) the M3–RCI by adopting the standard Coulomb energy at a temperature $T = 2$MeV; and (4) neglecting the RCI among the three isobars. The M1–, M2– and M3–RCI is found to no larger than 0.4. In particular, the M2–RCI is very close to zero. The effects of RCI in the a_{sym}/T of fragment are also studied. The M1– and M4–a_{sym}/T are found to be the lower and upper limitations of a_{sym}/T, respectively. The M2–a_{sym}/T overlaps the M4–a_{sym}/T, which indicates that the M2–RCI is negligible, at the same time the RCI among the three isobars can be neglected. A relative consistent low values of M3–a_{sym}/T (7.5 ± 2.5) are found in very neutron-rich isobars.

PACS numbers: 21.65.Cd, 25.70.Pq, 25.70.Mn
Keywords: isobaric yield ratio, residue Coulomb interaction, symmetry energy, neutron-rich nucleus

arXiv:1402.5493v1 [nucl-th] 22 Feb 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of nuclear symmetry energy (NSE) has continuously attracted attention because of its importance in nuclear physics and astrophysics. Lots of theoretical and experimental methods are proposed to investigate the NSE of nuclear matters from sub-saturation to supra-saturation densities, which can both be produced in heavy-ion collisions (HICs) [1]. Among the various observable to study NSE — such as flow [2], emission of light particles (n, p and the ratio between them) [3–5], isospin diffusion [6], neutron-skin thickness [7], isoscaling (for colliding source or fragments) [8–21] or m-scaling [22–24], isobaric yield ratio (IYR) [24–29], etc. — the IYR methods have attracted much attention recently [23–37]. In IYR, parameters depending only on the mass of fragment cancel out, which makes the IYR methods possible to study the symmetry energy of neutron-rich fragment specifically. In some similar isobaric analysis, the symmetry energy of nucleus (including the volume symmetry energy and surface symmetry energy) has also been investigated [38–40].

Different to the uniform value of parameter in mass formula, the symmetry-energy coefficient (a_{sym}) of nucleus or fragment in isobaric methods becomes nonuniform, and depends on the neutron-excess ($I \equiv N - Z$) and mass number A [26, 33–35, 38–40]. a_{sym} is found to decrease with increasing I in isobaric chains [40], and similar phenomena is also shown in fragments produced in HICs [26, 33, 34]. The difference between a_{sym} (or a_{sym}/T) of isobars is found to decrease when the nucleus (fragment) becomes more neutron-rich. In particular, a_{sym} (a_{sym}/T) of nucleus (fragment) with large neutron-excess is found to be very similar [33, 40, 41]. It is also shown that the volume-symmetry-energy coefficient (b_v) and the surface-symmetry-energy coefficient (b_s) both decrease with increasing I, but tend to be very similar in the very neutron-rich nucleus (when $I > 13$) [40].

In IYR methods to determine the symmetry energy of fragment, the residue Coulomb interaction (RCI) between isobars is also difficult to be known due to the difficulty to separate the temperature and energy terms contributing to free energy. In previous works, the standard Coulomb term is used to calculate RCI [38–40], or the value of a_c/T (the ratio of Coulomb energy coefficient to temperature) for mirror nuclei [IYR(m)] is used as an approximation for more neutron-rich fragments. For examples, the value of a_c/T is determined from the scaling between the IYR(m) and the Z/A of the reaction systems in a series of reactions, and a_c/T is used for the $I = 3$ fragments [26]. Though a_c/T can also be fitted from IYR(m) in a single reaction [27, 33, 34]. it is supposed to be influenced by the volume or mass of projectile [42]. But it is also suggested that the volume dependence of a_c/T disappears in the reactions induced by neutron-rich projectiles [37]. The different RCI approximations request the comparison between them, and the study of the RCI effects in the resultant symmetry energy of neutron-rich fragment is also required, which will be focused on in this article. The article is organized as follows: Sec. II describes the IYR method and the approximations of the RCI; Sec. III discusses the results of the different RCIs and their effects in the symmetry energy of fragment in measured reactions; Sec. IV presents the summary of the article.

* Email: machunwang@126.com

II. MODEL DESCRIPTION

In free energy based theories, the yield of fragment is determined by its free energy, the property of colliding source, temperature, etc. in HICs above the Fermi energy [24, 43–45]. In a modified Fisher model (MFM), the free energy of a cluster (fragment) equals its binding energy at nonzero temperature, which includes the contribution of entropy [45]. This makes the IYR method can conveniently determine the symmetry energy of fragment. The description of IYR methods can be partly found in Refs. [24–27, 31, 33, 34]. For a better understanding of the methods, first we briefly describe the IYR methods in MFM. Then the methods dealing with RCI will be intensively described.

In MFM the yield of a fragment with mass A and neutron-excess I, $Y(A,I)$, is given by [44, 45],

$$Y(A,I) = CA^{-\tau}exp\{[W(A,I)+\mu_n N+\mu_p Z]/T + N\ln(N/A)+Z\ln(Z/A)\}, \quad (1)$$

where C is a constant; $A^{-\tau}$ originates from the entropy of fragment; τ is independent of fragment size, but is nonuniform in different reactions [45, 46]. μ_n and μ_p are the neutron and proton chemical potentials, respectively; T is the temperature, and $W(A,I)$ is the free energy of cluster at T, which equals the binding energy of the cluster. At a given ρ and T, $W(A,I)$ can be parameterized as the Weiszäcker-Bethe form mass formula [47],

$$W(A,I) = a_v(\rho,T)A - a_s(\rho,T)A^{2/3} - E_c(\rho,T) - a_{sym}(\rho,T)I^2/A - \delta(N,Z), \quad (2)$$

where the indices v, s, and sym represent the volume-, surface-, and symmetry- energy, respectively. $E_c(\rho,T)$ represents the Coulomb energy (assuming a spherical expansion, at low densities the Coulomb energy decreases as $\rho^{1/3}$). The coefficients contain contributions both from the binding energy and the entropy of the cluster due to nonzero T [45]. For simplification, $a_i(\rho,T)$ is written as a_i (i represents the different indices).

Inserting Eq. (2) into Eq. (1), the IYR between isobars differing by 2 units in I, $R(I+2,I,A)$, can be defined as,

$$\begin{aligned} R(I+2,I,A) &= Y(A,I+2)/Y(A,I) \\ &= exp\{[W(I+2,A)-W(I,A)+(\mu_n-\mu_p)]/T \\ &\quad + S_{mix}(I+2,A)-S_{mix}(I,A)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $S_{mix}(I,A) = N\ln(N/A)+Z\ln(Z/A)$. Assuming that a_v, a_s, μ_n, and μ_p for the I and $I+2$ isobars are the same, inserting Eq. (2) into Eq. (3), and taking logarithm of the resultant equation, one gets the IYR for odd-I isobars,

$$\ln[R(I+2,I,A)] - \Delta_I = [\Delta\mu - 4a_{sym}(I+1)/A - \Delta E_c(I+2,I,A)]/T, \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta_I = S_{mix}(I+2,A) - S_{mix}(I,A)$; $\Delta E_c(I+2,I,A) = E_c(I+2) - E_c(I)$; $\Delta\mu = \mu_n - \mu_p$, Z is the charge numbers of the reference nucleus (A,I). The pairing energy in Eq. (4) is avoided in the odd-I isobars. It is hard to know $\Delta\mu$, a_{sym}, ΔE_c, and T exactly, because of the difficulty to separate them in the ratios. $\Delta\mu$ is assumed to change slowly in the reactions, thus $\Delta\mu/T$ can be the same in $R(I+2,I,A)$ and $R(I,I-2,A)$. Then $\Delta E_c/T$ is the retained term that affects a_{sym}/T in the IYR methods. Taking the difference between the neighboring IYRs,

$$\ln[R(I,I-2,A)] - \ln[R(I+2,I,A)] - \Delta_{21} = 8a_{sym}/(AT) - \Delta E_{c21}/T, \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta_{21} = \Delta_{I-2} - \Delta_I$, and $\Delta E_{c21} = \Delta E_c(I,I-2,A) - \Delta E_c(I+2,I,A)$ is the RCI among the (I+2,A), (I, A) and (I-2,A) isobars. Since $\Delta E_{c21}/T$ can be viewed as one parameter, it is also called as RCI between IYRs, and it is the parameter that will be focused on in this article. For neutron-rich fragment, a_{sym}/T can be obtained from Eq. (5) as follows [26, 33–35],

$$a_{sym}/T = \tfrac{A}{8}\{\ln[R(I,I-2,A)] - \ln[R(I+2,I,A)] - \Delta_{21} + \Delta E_{c21}/T\}, \quad (6)$$

As mentioned above, due to the RCI ($\Delta E_c/T$ or through a_c/T) is hard to be known, four approximations are used to deal with RCI in previous works,

(i): M1: $\Delta E_c/T$ (or a_c/T) is obtained from IYR(m). The following equation is used to extract the $\Delta E_c/T$ and $\Delta\mu/T$ based on Eq. (4),

$$\mathrm{IYR(m)} = \ln[R(1,-1,A)] = (\Delta\mu - \Delta E_c)/T, \quad (7)$$

The value of $\Delta\mu/T$, at the same time $\Delta E_c/T$ (or a_c/T) for the mirror nuclei can be determined. Assuming that a_c/T are the same for all the fragments, $\Delta E_{c21}/T$ in Eq. (6) is known [27, 33, 34, 37].

(ii): M2: $\Delta E_{c21}/T$ is determined from the difference between IYRs. Considering the free energy per particle at T and pressure P in MFM, the ratio of free energy to temperature near the critical point can be expanded as [24, 25],

$$\Psi(m_f,A,T,H)/T = \tfrac{1}{2}am_f^2 + \tfrac{1}{4}bm_f^4 + \tfrac{1}{6}cm_f^6 - \tfrac{H}{T}m_f + o(m_f^8), \quad (8)$$

where the parameters a, b and c depend on T and ρ, and are used for fitting; $m_f = I/A$. H is the conjugate field. The free energy is even in the exchange of $m_f \to -m_f$, reflecting the invariance of nuclear forces when exchanging N and Z. This symmetry is violated by H, which arises when the source is asymmetric in chemical composition. H and m_f are related to each other through the relation $m_f = \frac{\delta F}{\delta H}$ [25]. The Coulomb energy for large Z nucleus can be written as,

$$\frac{E_c}{A} = 0.77\frac{Z^2}{A^2}A^{2/3} = \frac{0.77}{4}(1-m_f)^2A^{2/3}, \quad (9)$$



FIG. 1. (Color online) The isobaric yield ratio for mirror nuclei [IYR(m)] in the 140A MeV ^{58}Ni + ^{9}Be reactions [48] and the 1A GeV ^{124,136}Xe + Pb reactions [49]. In (a) the fitting function is according to Eq. (7), and in (b) the fitting use the function using $y = \Delta\mu/T + dA^{2/3}$. (c) RCI between the mirror nuclei, with full and open symbols representing RCIs according to panels (a) and (b).



FIG. 2. (Color online) The correlation between $\Delta \ln R/A$ and $1/A^2$ of fragment in the 1A GeV ^{124,136}Xe + Pb [49], and 140A MeV ^{58}Ni + ^{9}Be reactions [48]. The lines represent the fitting results according to Eq. (10).

Adding this term to the free energy Ψ/T, a quadratic and linear term in m_f are introduced, which modify the symmetry energy coefficient and H. Also a term independent on m_f is introduced [25]. The RCI is relevant only in the calculation of a_{sym}/T for the large mass fragments in the IYR method, thus the $o(m^4)$ terms are negligible. At the same time, $(1/A^2) \propto m^2$. According to Eq. (3), the fit of the quantity $[\ln R(I, I-2, A) - \ln R(I+2, I, A)]/A$ allows the estimation of the fitting parameters in Eq. (8) and the Coulomb term. The fitting function between the difference of IYRs and RCI is [24],

$$\Delta \ln R/A = a'/A^2 + dA^{2/3}, \quad (10)$$

where $\Delta \ln R = \ln[R(I, I-2, A)] - \ln[R(I+2, I, A)]$. a' and d are fitting parameters. The a_{sym}/T of neutron-rich fragments can be obtained as,

$$\frac{a_{sym}}{T} = \frac{A}{8}(\Delta \ln R - \Delta_{21}) - dA^{2/3}, \quad (11)$$

The $dA^{2/3}$ term serves as the RCI.

(iii): M3: ΔE_{c21} is calculated by adopting $E_C = \frac{3}{5}\frac{Z^2e^2}{1.2A^{1/3}}[1 - \frac{5}{4}(\frac{3}{2\pi})^{2/3}\frac{1}{Z^{2/3}}]$ [39, 40], and using $T =$ 2MeV since a relative low temperature is obtained using similar IYR methods [31, 32]. In this method, the RCI is

$$\Delta E_{c21}/T = [E_c(I-2) + E_c(I+2) - 2E_c(I)]/T, \quad (12)$$

(iv): M4: We adopt a new approximation in this article, i.e., the RCI is omitted since it is the difference between three isobars, which is different to the RCI between two isobars and can be supposed to be negligible (the RCI between two isobars depends both on the m_f^2 and m_f).



FIG. 3. (Color online) The RCIs between isobars in the 1A GeV ^{136}Xe + Pb reaction using the M1–M3 approximations.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The yields of fragments in the 140A MeV ^{58}Ni + ^{9}Be reactions, which were measured by Mocko *et al.* at the National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory (NSCL) in Michigan State University [48], and in the 1A GeV ^{124,136}Xe + Pb reactions, which were measured by Henzlova *et al.* at the FRagment Separator (FRS), GSI Darmstadt [49], will be used to perform the analysis.

First, we determine a_c/T from IYR(m) for M1. In Fig. 1(a), the IYR(m) is plotted (similar results can be found in Refs. [33, 34, 37]). The form of Coulomb energy adopted is $E_c = a_c Z(Z-1)/A^{1/3}$, and the resultant fitting function being $y = \Delta\mu/T + 2a_c(Z-1)/(A^{1/3}T)$ according to Eq. (7), in which the quantity $2a_c(Z-1)/(A^{1/3}T)$ serves as RCI in IYR(m). In Fig. 1(b), the fitting function is modified to $y = \Delta\mu/T + dA^{2/3}$ due to $(Z-1)/A^{1/3} \propto A^{2/3}$, and a_c/T is assorted to the parameter d, in which $d \cdot A^{2/3}$ serve as RCI in IYR(m). The resultant RCIs according to panels (a) and (b) are plotted in Fig. 1(c), which has a relative little difference of no larger than 0.2.

Second, d in M2 is determined by fitting the difference between IYRs according to Eq. (10). In Fig. 2, the correlation between $(\Delta\ln R - \Delta_{21})/A$ and $1/A^2$ of fragments in the 1A GeV ^{124,136}Xe + Pb and 140A MeV ^{58}Ni + ^{9}Be reactions are plotted. The data can be well fitted by Eq. (10) in the three reactions. But the distributions of the $(\Delta\ln R - \Delta_{21})/A \sim 1/A^2$ correlation show different trend in fragments of the same I in the three reactions, and the same phenomena also happens in fragments of different I in the same reaction.

Furthermore, taking the fragments in the 1A GeV ^{136}Xe + Pb reaction as an example, the RCI in the M1–M3 approximations are compared, which are plotted in Fig. 3. The values of RCI show that M1 > M3 > M2, with M1– and M3–RCI are no larger than 0.4, and the M2–RCI very close to zero. The results verify that in Eq. (10) the parameter a' includes almost the whole real RCI relating to the m_f^2 term, which results in M2–RCI is very small and can be neglected.



FIG. 4. (Color online) The a_{sym}/T of fragments in the 140A MeV ^{58}Ni + ^{9}Be reactions. The labels M1 (star), M2 (triangle), M3 (circle), and M4 (square) denote the a_{sym}/T of fragments using the corresponding RCI.



FIG. 5. (Color online) The same as in Fig. 4 but for the fragments in the 1A GeV ^{124}Xe + Pb reactions.



FIG. 6. (Color online) The same as in Fig. 4 but for the fragments in the 1A GeV ^{136}Xe + Pb reactions.

It is important to study the effects of RCI in the resultant a_{sym}/T of neutron-rich fragments. The M1– and M3–a_{sym}/T are calculated according to Eq. (6) using the corresponding RCI, and the M2–a_{sym}/T according to Eq. (11). First, the a_{sym}/T of fragments in the ^{58}Ni



FIG. 7. (Color online) The values of a_{sym}/T for fragments using the M3–RCI (omitting the RCI) in the 1A GeV ^{136}Xe + Pb reactions. The number in the square denotes the mass number of the fragment.

reaction are plotted in Fig. 4 and those of fragments in the ^{124,136}Xe reactions are plotted in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, respectively. a_c/T =0.55, 0.71 and 0.52 are used for M1 for the ^{58}Ni, ^{124}Xe and ^{136}Xe reactions is used, respectively. Generally, the M1–a_{sym}/T and M4–a_{sym}/T form the lower and upper limitations of a_{sym}/T. The M1–a_{sym}/T being the lower limitation of a_{sym}/T indicates that the direct use of a_c/T from IYR(m) may underestimate the real value of a_{sym}/T in some degree. The M2–a_{sym}/T almost overlaps the M4–a_{sym}/T. Since the M2–a_{sym}/T incorporates the m_f^2 term of RCI (which is called as the effective symmetry energy [25]), the result also indicates that the m_f^2 dependence of RCI is also very small, and the M2– and M4–a_{sym}/T are close to the actual value. Thus the omission of RCI among three isobars is reasonable in determining the coefficient of symmetry energy of neutron-rich fragment using Eq. (6).

To see the evolution of a_{sym}/T in isobars, for a series of isobars in the 1A GeV ^{136}Xe + Pb reactions, the values of M3–a_{sym}/T are re-plotted in Fig. 7 since the M3–a_{sym}/T is not influenced by the fitting parameters of RCI or the size of the reaction system. The re-plotted isobars are from A = 57 to 107 in the step of 10, plus the A = 51, 91, and 111 isobars. For each isobaric chain, a_{sym}/T decreases as the fragment becomes more neutron-rich. But a relative consistent values of 7.5 ± 2.5 is found in the neutron-rich fragments for all the plotted isobaric chains, which are shown as the shadowed area.

We will comment on the question raised in the result of A and I dependence of a_{sym}/T. Actually, in isobaric method, one can never expect a uniform symmetry energy coefficients except the nuclear have the same neutron and proton density difference which result in the isospin phenomena in HICs. The nuclear density evolves in neutron-rich fragments, thus the isospin effects illustrates. It is discussed to differ the core and surface regions of a neutron-rich nucleus, in which the neutron and proton densities differ evenly while in the surface the neutron and proton densities differ largely [36, 50, 51]. For the neutron-rich nucleus or fragments, we should also expect the evolution of symmetry energy due to the change of proton and neutron density differences. Based on the equilibrium assumption, the symmetry energy of identical source is supposed to be same, and a_{sym}/T of the source obtained should independent on A and I. It is revealed that the chemical potential difference between neutrons and protons, which is an important index of symmetry energy (as in isoscaling), is also found to vary little in the central collisions and supports the assumption that the symmetry energy is identical in similar sources [36]. The relative uniform a_{sym}/T is found in prefragments, but is believed to be modified by the decay process and the A and I dependence of a_{sym}/T is observed in the final fragments [15, 24, 35]. It is also know for neutron-rich nucleus, the surface-symmetry-energy and volume-symmetry-energy should be included (the coefficients denoted as b_s and b_v, respectively). b_s and b_v can be obtained form a_{sym}/A [39, 40]; and for finite temperatures neutron-rich fragments, b_s and b_v of can also be obtained from a_{sym}/AT by assuming the T^2 dependence of the coefficients in the mass formula [41], which are both found coincident with the theoretical results.

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, the RCI effects in the a_{sym}/T of fragments in the IYR methods are investigated. Four RCI approximations are investigated: (1) the M1–RCI adoting the a_c/T determined by IYR(m); (2) the M2–RCI by fitting the difference between IYRs based on the free energy of the fragment; (3) the M4–RCI by adopting the theoretical Coulomb energy and an IYR temperature T = 2 MeV; and (4) neglecting the RCI among the related three isobars. The M1–, M2– and M3–RCI are found to have relative small values no larger than 0.4. In particular, the M2–RCI is the smallest one in the three RCIs due to it includes only very small part of the actual RCI. The effects of RCI in the a_{sym}/T of fragments are also studied. For fragments in the ^{58}Ni, and ^{124,136}Xe reactions, the M1– and M4–a_{sym}/T are found to be the lower and upper limitations of a_{sym}/T. Due to the M2–RCI only includes part of the RCI, it enhances the value of M2–a_{sym}/T, which should be called as the effective a_{sym}/T [25]. The M4–a_{sym}/T (omitting the RCI), which overlaps the M2–a_{sym}/T, indicates that the enhancement of a_{sym}/T in M2 is very small, and the m_f^2 dependence of RCI in Eq. (10) should be very small. The omission of RCI among three isobars is verified to be reasonable. It can also be concluded that the M1– and M3–RCI actually underestimate the real value of a_{sym}/T due to the uncer-

tainty introduced by a_c/T and temperature in them.

The M3–a_{sym}/T of some isobaric chains are compared, which is found to decreases when the fragment becomes more neutron-rich. Relative consistent value is found in the very neutron-rich fragments, which indicates that the a_{sym}/T of neutron-rich fragments are similar.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grants No. 10905017, the Program for Science & Technology Innovation Talents in Universities of Henan Province (13HASTIT046), and Young Teacher Project in Henan Normal University (HNU), China.

[1] B.-A. Li, L.-W. Chen, C. M. Ko, Phys. Rep. **464**, 113 (2008).
[2] P. Russotto *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **697**, 471 (2011); M. D. Cozma, *ibid.* 700, 139 (2011); B. A. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4221 (2000); S. Gautam, A. D. Sood, R. K. Puri, and J. Aichelin, Phys. Rev. C **83**, 034606 (2011); S. Gautam, R. Chugh, A. D. Sood, R. K. Puri, C. Hartnack, and J. Aichelin, J. Phys. G **37**, 085102 (2010); S. Gautam and A. D. Sood, Phys. Rev. C **82**, 014604 (2010); S. Kumar, Rajni, and S. Kumar, ibid. **82**, 024610 (2010); S. Kumar and S. Kumar, Cent. Eur. J. Phys. **9**, 986 (2011).
[3] S. Kumar, Y. G. Ma, G. Q. Zhang, and C. L. Zhou, Phys. Rev. C **84**, 044620 (2011); S. Kumar, Y. G. Ma, G. Q. Zhang, *ibid.* **86**, 044616 (2012).
[4] M. A. Famiano *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 052701 (2006); D. Hilscher *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **36**, 208 (1987); B. A. Li, C. M. Ko, and Z. Z. Ren, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1644 (1997); B. A. Li, L. W. Chen, G. C. Yong, and W. Zuo, Phys. Lett. B **634**, 378 (2006); Y. Zhang, P. Danielewicz, M. Famiano, Z. Li, W. G. Lynch, and M. B. Tsang, Phys. Lett. B **664**, 145 (2008); M. B. Tsang, Y. Zhang, P. Danielewicz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 122701 (2009); J. Pu, J. H. Chen, S. Kumar, Y. G. Ma, C. W. Ma, G. Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 047603 (2013).
[5] J. Dong, W. Zuo, and J. Gu, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 014303 (2013).
[6] M. B. Tsang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 062701 (2004); M. A. Famiano *et al.*, *ibid.*, **97**, 052701 (2006); M. B. Tsang *et al.*, *ibid.*, **102**, 122701 (2009).
[7] X. Roca-Maza, M. Centelles, X. Viñas, and M. Warda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 252501 (2011); M. K. Gaidarov, A. N. Antonov, P. Sarriguren, and E. Moya de Guerra, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 064319 (2012); S. Yoshida and H. Sagawa, *ibid.*, **69**, 024318 (2004); L. W. Chen, C. M. Ko, B. A. Li, *ibid.*, **72**, 064309 (2005); J. Dong, W. Zuo, J. Gu, and U. Lombardo, *ibid.*, **85**, 034308 (2012) .
[8] Y. G. Ma *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 064610 (2004); *ibid.*, **72**, 064603 (2005); R. Wada *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 064618 (2012); M. Colonna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 042701 (2013); W. D. Tian *et al.*, Chin. Phys. Lett. **22**, 306 (2005).
[9] A. S. Botvina, O. V. Lozhkin, and W. Trautmann, Phys. Rev. C **65**, 044610 (2002).
[10] M. B. Tsang, W. A. Friedman, C. K. Gelbke, W. G. Lynch, G. Verde, and H. Xu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5023 (2001).
[11] H. S. Xu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 716 (2000).
[12] D. Q. Fang, Y. G. Ma, C. Zhong *et al.*, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **34**, 2173 (2007).
[13] Y. Fu, D. Q. Fang, Y. G. Ma *et al.*, Chin. Phys. Lett. **26**, 082503 (2009).
[14] M. Colonna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 042701 (2013).
[15] Z. Chen, S. Kowalski, M. Huang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 064613 (2010).
[16] A. Ono, P. Danielewicz, W. A. Friedman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 051601(R) (2003); *ibid*, **70**, 041604(R) (2004).
[17] S. R. Souza, M. B. Tsang, B. V. Carlson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 044606 (2009).
[18] G. A. Souliotis, D. V. Shetty, M. Veselsky *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **68**, 024605 (2003).
[19] G. A. Souliotis, D. V. Shetty, A. Keksis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 024606 (2006).
[20] W. D. Tian, Y. G. Ma, X.Z. Cai *et al.*, Chin. Phys. Lett. **22**, 306 (2005).
[21] P. Zhou, W. D. Tian, Y. G. Ma *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **84**, 037605 (2011).
[22] M. Huang, Z. Chen, S. Kowalski *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. A **847**, 233 (2011).
[23] P. Marini, A. Bonasera, G. A. Souliotis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 024603 (2013).
[24] P. Marini, A. Bonasera, A. McIntosh *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 034617 (2012).
[25] M. Huang, A. Bonasera, Z. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 044618 (2011).
[26] M. Huang, Z. Chen, S. Kowalski *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 044620 (2010).
[27] C. W. Ma, F. Wang, Y. G. Ma and C. Jin, Phys. Rev. C **83**, 064620 (2011).
[28] W. Lin, R. Wada, M. Huang *et al.*, Nucl. Sci. Tech. **24**, 050511 (2013).
[29] R. Wada, M. Huang, W. Lin *et al.*, Nucl. Sci. Tech. **24**, 050501 (2013).
[30] S. Mallik and G. Chaudhuri, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 011602(R) (2013).
[31] C. W. Ma, J. Pu, Y. G. Ma, R. Wada, S. S. Wang, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 054611 (2012).
[32] C. W. Ma, X. L. Zhao, J. Pu *et al.*, 2013 Phys. Rev. C **88** 014609.
[33] C.-W. Ma, J. Pu, H.-L. Wei *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. A **48**, 78 (2012).
[34] C.-W. Ma, J. Pu, S.-S. Wang, and H.-L. Wei, Chin. Phys. Lett. **29**, 062101 (2012).

[35] C. W. Ma, H. L. Song, J. Pu *et al.*, Chin. Phys. C **37**, 024102 (2013).
[36] C. W. Ma, S. S. Wang, Y. L. Zhang, H. L. Wei, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 034618 (2013); *ibid.*, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **40**, 125106 (2013).
[37] C. W. Ma, S. S. Wang, H. L. Wei, and Y. G. Ma, Chin. Phys. Lett. **30**, 052101 (2013); C. W. Ma, H. L. Wei, Y. G. Ma, Phys. Rev. C **88**, 044612 (2013)
[38] J. Jänecke, and T. W. O'Donnell, Nucl. Phys. A **781**, 317 (2007).
[39] H. Mei, Y. Huang, J. M. Yao and H. Chen, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **39**, 015107 (2012).
[40] C. W. Ma, J. B. Yang, M. Yu, J. Pu, S. S. Wang, H. L. Wei, Chin. Phys. Lett. **29**, 092101 (2012).
[41] C. W. Ma, C. Y. Qiao, S. S. Wang, F. M. Lu, L. Chen, and M. T. Guo, Nucl. Sci. Tech. **24**, 050510 (2013).
[42] S. R. Souza and M. B. Tsang, Phys. Rev. C **85** 024603 (2012).
[43] S. Albergo, S. Costa, E. Costanzo, and A. Rubbino, Nuovo Cimento A **89**, 1 (1985).
[44] R. W. Minich, S. Agarwal, A. Bujak *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **118**, (1982) 458.
[45] A. S. Hirsch, A. Bujak, J. E. Finn *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **29**, 508 (1984).
[46] M. Huang, R. Wada, Z. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **82**, 054602(R) (2010).
[47] C. F. von Weizsäcker, Z. Phys. **96**, 431 (1935); H. A. Bethe and R. F. Bacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **8**, 82 (1936).
[48] M. Mocko, M. B. Tsang, L. Andronenko *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **74**, 054612 (2006).
[49] D. Henzlova, K.-H. Schmidt, M. V. Ricciardi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 044616 (2008).
[50] C. W. Ma, and S. S. Wang, Chin. Phys. C **35**, 1017 (2011).
[51] C. W. Ma, H. L. Wei, J. Y. Wang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 034606 (2009).